

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
10/014,796	12/14/2001	Erhard Mueller	24857	1639	
7590 10/07/2004		EXAMINER			
NATH & ASSOCIATES PLLC 1030 15TH Street NW - 6th Floor			GRAY, JILL M		
Washington, DC 20005			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1774		
			DATE 1444 ED 10/07/200	DATE MAILED 10/07/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

					θ				
		Application No.	Applica	nt(s)	' <i>.</i>				
-		10/014,796	MUELLE	ER ET AL.					
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit						
		Jill M. Gray	1774						
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication a or Reply	appears on the cover	sheet with the correspon	dence address					
A SH THE - Exte after - If the - If NC - Failt Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REF MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. e period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a representation of the period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perior to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by state reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	N. 1.136(a). In no event, howevel eply within the statutory minir od will apply and will expire S tute, cause the application to	er, may a reply be timely filed num of thirty (30) days will be cons IX (6) MONTHS from the mailing of become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C	sidered timely. late of this communicat . § 133).	ion.				
Status		٠							
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19	July 2004.							
- 2a)⊠	This action is FINAL . 2b) The Triangle Triangl	his action is non-fina	l .						
3)□	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the ments is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.								
Disposit	ion of Claims								
5)	Claim(s) 1,4-11 and 26-55 is/are pending in 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withded claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1, 4-11, 26-55 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	rawn from considera							
Applicat	ion Papers		· · · · · ·						
9)[The specification is objected to by the Exami	ner.							
10)	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) a	ccepted or b)□ obje	cted to by the Examiner	•					
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the	ne drawing(s) be held i	n abeyance. See 37 CFR	1.85(a).					
11)	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the	•	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •		` .*				
Priority (under 35 U.S.C. § 119								
a)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docume 2. Certified copies of the priority docume 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority docume application from the International Buresee the attached detailed Office action for a life	ents have been receivents have been receivents have been received and the second secon	ved. ved in Application No ve been received in this a)).						
Attachmen	t(s)								
	e of References Cited (PTO-892)		nterview Summary (PTO-413)						
3) 🗹 infori	re of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/0 r No(s)/Mail Date	₍₈₎ 5) 🔲 N	aper No(s)/Mail Date lotice of Informal Patent Applic ther:	ation (PTO-152)					

Art Unit: 1774

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

The cancellation of claims 2-3 and 12-25 is noted. Also, the submission of new claims 26-55 is noted. Currently, claims 1, 4-11, and 26-55 are under prosecution.

The objection of claims 7, 9 and 22 is withdrawn in view of applicants' amendment.

The rejection of claims 1, 6, 8, 10, 12-21 and 24-25 under 35 U.S.C 112, second paragraph is most in view of applicants' amendments.

The rejection of claims 12, 14, and 17 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Wang et al, 4,705,820 is most in view of applicants' amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 4, 28, 38, and 48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

More specifically, each of these claims set forth that the terpolymer contains trimethylene carbonate and e-caprolactone in a weight ratio between 95:5 to 5:95. It is unclear as to whether this ratio refers to the ratio of these components to the terpolymer per se, or if this is a ratio between the trimethylene carbonate and e-caprolactone.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Art Unit: 1774

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 4-11, and 26-55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wang et al, 4,708,820 (Wang) in view of Bezwada et al, 5,371,176 and 4,994,074 (Bezwada), for reasons of record.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed July 19, 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicants argue that one of ordinary skill in the art would not arrive at the present suture material from the cited references. Specifically, the disclosure of '820 refers to copolymers (all polymers presented in the examples are composed of only two monomers) and does not exhibit defined terpolymer compositions. The polymer of '820 is not indicated to be waxy. Instead, it has good tensile strength, which is not a relevant feature of the present waxy terpolymers.

In this regard, Wang teaches that his polymer is amorphous with a low glass temperature. This teaching would lead one of ordinary skill in the art to reasonably believe that the polymer has some degree of amorphous properties that tend towards what can be construed as "waxy". In addition, Wang specifically teaches that his polymer can contain other monomers such as caprolactones, and disclosed examples and preferred embodiments do not constitute a teaching away form a broader

Art Unit: 1774

disclosure or nonpreferred embodiments. *In re Susi*, 440 F.2d 442, 169 USPQ 423 (CCPA 1971). Accordingly, the fact that Wang only discloses copolymers in his examples is of no moment. Note also, the claims are not all limited to any particular glass temperature or molecular mass or any other property that clearly defines what constitutes "waxy".

Applicants argue that the polymer of '074 discloses partially crystalline low molecular weight copolymers based on caprolactone and glycolide and glycolic acid is added to control molar mass and viscosity. Further arguing that such a polymer differs from the inventive terpolymer in composition, structure and characteristics.

In this regard, Bezwada, '074 is relied upon for all that he would have reasonably imparted to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made.

In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

Applicants argue that with regards to the viscosity data, such data from the references cannot be readily compared to that contemplated by the present invention without recalculating and fitting to adequate conditions, because viscosity data are significantly affected by the analytical conditions employed, namely concentration.

In this concern, claims 1, 4-7, 9-11, 27-31, 34-41, and 44-46 are not limited to any particular viscosity. Moreover, the composition of Wang teaches a viscosity within

Art Unit: 1774

the range contemplated by applicants. See column 4, lines 36-40. This teaching in combination with his teachings that other monomers can be added would have reasonably suggested to the skilled artisan that even with the addition of other monomers, the desired viscosity would be within the disclosed range.

Accordingly, it is the examiner's position that the combined teachings of Wang and Bezwada would have rendered obvious the invention as claimed in the present claims.

No claims are allowed.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 1774

Page 6

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jill M. Gray whose telephone number is 571-272-1524. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 10:30-7:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rena Dye can be reached on 571-272-3186. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Jill M. Gray Examiner Art Unit 1774

jmg

RENA DYE SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

AN. 1174